REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 69-74 and 78 are pending and presented for examination. Claims 69 and 72 are amended. No new matter is introduced. Withdrawal of the rejections and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the Amendments and following remarks.

Amendments

Amendments to claims 69 and 72 recite "*the first transfer card has no direct connection to the second interface card to assure that the second circuit card is not influenced when the first transfer card is replaced*". Support for the Amendments may be found, for example, in Fig. 5 and related texts on p. 8 ll.10-16 and p. 9, ll. 6-7. Fig. 5 shows that each circuit card 10 corresponds to one interface transfer card 30 that connects with one interface card 40 through a data communication link 50, and the interface card 40 connects with switched network cards 20. Note that Fig. 5 shows neither direct connection between the first interface transfer card 30 and the second interface card 40, nor direct connection between the second interface transfer card 30 and the first interface card 40. When replacing an interface transfer card 30, it is assured that another circuit card 10 will not be influenced.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 69-74 and 78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Amendments to claims 69 and 72 render moot the rejections to the "*being configured for isolating any mutual influence between the first transfer card and the second interface card*" language that was previously presented. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 69-73 and 78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0007946 A1 to Kastenholz, et al. ("Kastenholz"). Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Kastenholz in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,667,973 to Gorshe et al.("Gorshe").

Examiner asserts that Kastenholz teaches a system for data communication by correlating the first circuit card to **line card module 102**, the first transfer card to **local line card 202**, the second circuit card to **expanded interconnect board 138**, the second transfer card to **ASIC 410a/b**, the first switched network card to **local interconnect module 118**, the first interface card to **interconnect board 218**, and the second interface card to **interconnect board 220**, the first data communication link to **communication lines 217**.

Claims 69 and 72 now recite, in part, "*the first transfer card has no direct connection to the second interface card to assure that the second circuit card is not influenced when the first transfer card is replaced*". Kastenholz fails to teach or suggest such elements.

At the end of the Amendment (page 10), a modified Fig. 5 of the specification is included for purposes of illustration. Note that a dashline from the first transfer card 30 to the second interface card 40 would be a direct connection between the first transfer card and the second interface card (which does **not** exist in the drawing that forms part of the specification). However, the absence of the dashline in the drawing as filed indicates that there is **no direct connection** between the first transfer card 30 and the second interface card 40.

In contrast, a **direct connection** as shown by the dashline in the modified illustration of Fig. 5 does exist in Kastenholz. The evidence of such a connection is shown plainly in Fig. 3 of Kastenholz (for the convenience of the Examiner, it is also attached at the end of the Amendment). Note that there are two solid lines (highlighted) between the first transfer card 202 and the second interface card 220 to show direct connection between the cards 202 and 220. Fig. 3 of Kastenholz and related text in paragraph 50 of Kastenholz describes that "the internal I/O ports 202a-202f connect with up to forty-eight internal communication lines 217 and couple information between the local line card module 102 and the local interconnect module 118". As a result of the direct connections between the first transfer card 202 and the second interface card 220, the first transfer card 202 would have influence on the second interface card 220 or vice versa. For example, if the first transfer card 202 fails or is replaced, the second interface card will be affected through the direct communication lines 217 between ports 202c-202-d of the first transfer card 202 and ports 0a, 7a of the second interface card 220 such that the

second circuit card will be influenced. Or, if the second interface card fails or is replaced, the first transfer card is influenced such that the first circuit card will be influenced. Therefore, Kastenholz actually **teaches away** from what is recited in the amended claims 69 and 72.

The Examiner acknowledges that Kastenholz fails to explicitly teach the first transfer card and the second interface card being configured for isolating any mutual influence between the first transfer card and the second interface card. However, the Examiner states, without citation or any reasoned support, that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to isolate any influence between the first transfer card and the second interface card, so as to maintain proper operation of the first transfer card and the second interface card. The Examiner also acknowledges that Kastenholz fails to explicitly teach backplanes. However, the Examiner states, again, without citation or any reasoned support, that it is well known in the art for cards/modules to connect to backplanes. Furthermore, the Examiner acknowledges that Kastenholz fails to explicitly disclose the cards not being a part of another, but the Examiner states, yet again, without citation or any reasoned support, that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to separate elements, in order to have distinct elements within a system.

The Examiner consistently uses such conclusory statements in rejecting claims when the recited elements in claims 69 and 72 are not present in the cited references. Such conclusory statements made without support or any articulation of the reasons why the claimed invention would be obvious are improper. The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is the clear articulation of the reasons why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 **should be made explicit**, MPEP 2143. This is true both for the individual elements discussed above **and** for the way in which they combine with each other.

For these reasons, each of the independent claims is respectfully believed to be patentable over Kastenholz. Each of the dependent claims is additionally believed to be patentable by virtue of their dependence from an allowable clam.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick M. Boucher/

Patrick M. Boucher
Reg. No. 44,037

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
PMB:JH2:s5s
61825672 v1